UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

Our Great Responsibility

By HELEN KELLER

VOLUME CVIII NUMBER 22

Chicago, February 15, 1932

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago. Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MRS. EDNA R. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 347
The Prohibition Problem—ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY 349
Jottings—J. H. H. 350

ARTICLES—
Our Great Responsibility—HELEN KELLER 351
Kingsley Hall—The Home of Fellowship—L. N. GUBIL 353
Notes from Geneva—SYDNEY STRONG 354
Old Methods—New Spirit—ESTHER LOWE GORDON 356

POETRY—
My Dream—FANIA KRUGER 347

THE STUDY TABLE—
War!—HERBERT A. STURGES 357

CORRESPONDENCE—
What Are the Naval Committees For?—BRADLEY STONE 358
Motion Pictures—DONN MARVIN 359
The League and India—MARY B. DAIN 359

THE FIELD—
An Open Letter to the American People—HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR 346
Are Juvenile Books Inane?—Lansing *State Journal* 360

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

An Open Letter to the American People

My Dear Friends: This day, the Twenty-Sixth of January, is as dear and meaningful to us of India as the Fourth of July is to you. Today we are celebrating the Second Anniversary of India's Declaration of Independence. Permit me to thank you, one and all, for the very keen interest you have been taking in India's Non-Violent Revolution and for the moral support you have been generously extending to the cause of Justice, Righteousness and Freedom championed by Mahatma Gandhi and the All-India National Congress.

Having been in your midst for over ten years, I have developed a strong attachment for you, my loyalty to America being second only to my loyalty to Truth and to India. Permit me to take but a moment of your time while I relate to you the grim facts of the present Indian situation.

(1) The Second Round Table Conference in London (September 14-December 1, 1931) failed, first, because the British government persisted in belittling the importance of Mahatma Gandhi and the All-India National Congress; secondly, because the British politicians and the British press persisted in magnifying the importance of so-called minorities and communal interests.

(2) A lesser man than Gandhi might have easily fallen into the trap set by wily British diplomats. Unlike Mr. Wilson, the Mahatma refused to sign on the dotted line.

(3) Having failed to cajole Mahatma Gandhi in London, the British have been trying to intimidate him into submission in India. Even before the Round Table Conference came to an end, the British administrators of India promulgated, of their own sweet will, the atrocious Bengal Ordinance which establishes a virtual state of Martial Law in Bengal.

Indeed, the Bengal Ordinance, whose operations now embrace practically the whole of India, has been rightly called by Mr. Reginald A. Reynolds (the Englishman who bore Gandhi's ultimatum to Viceroy Irwin in 1930), the White Terror compounded of "the Court of Star Chamber, Martial Law and Tsarism," intended to emasculate Bengal—and all India—comparable in brutish ferocity to the Reign of Terror in the Punjab after the Amritsar Massacre of April 13, 1919, by General Dyer. Arbitrary powers to commandeer movable and immovable property and to impose "collective fines" are vested in petty magistrates and police officials over whose decisions the people are denied the right to appeal to either the civil or the criminal courts. The Ordinance also sets up a special Court of Star Chamber composed of three judges, who are empowered to try cases *in camera* and in the absence of the

(*Continued on page* 359)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CVIII MONDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1932 Number 22

MY DREAM

I saw him on a gilded throne,
Then in a field against a stone.
His face was meek; his shirt was torn;
He patiently tied the shocks of corn.
With calloused feet and bleeding breast
He plowed the field; he took no rest.
I saw his blood upon the ground
But through his pain there came no sound.
I saw him climb a sunlit tree
Then calmly swim the roughened sea.
A searching face; a dreamer's sight
Which gave the gloomy hills a light.
The field was fresh—a silver gleam,
And Gandhi stood beside a stream.

FANIA KRUGER

There is apparently no limit to the indecency to which the British government in India is willing to go in order to break down the resistance of a people bravely struggling for liberty. Having found that force and violence are only serving to stiffen the courage of the Indian masses, the administration has resorted to corruption. Since beating and confining their bodies does not avail anything the *Raj* now attempts to buy their souls. Thus see the following Associated Press dispatch:

GOOD CONDUCT PAYS

BOMBAY, (AP)—It was announced today that life grants of money will be made to certain persons on condition that the recipients "continue their good conduct, showing steadfast loyalty to the King-Emperor and rendering active service to the legal government in British India."

The first individuals to benefit from this device received grants today of 259 rupees (about $65) which will be paid annually as long as they live. Half that sum will be continued through the next generation. There has been a rush of applicants.

This beats anything we have ever seen, or can remember. In its bare essence, of course, it is bribery. The official money-changer stands in the market place, and offers to purchase any one who will publicly sell himself to the government. That there will be plenty of "takers" for such an offer goes, of course, without saying. But who are these men and women who will thus feather their nests with the proceeds of the sale of themselves, their contemporaries, and their posterity? The leaders of the community, the influential spokesmen of the common weal, the great souls who sway the destiny of nations? On the contrary, the only ones who will thus accept the money of their oppressors are the scurvy riff-raff of the streets, the selfish sycophants who seek a quick and sure profit at any expense to humankind. And do the British imagine that it is dirty scum of this sort which turns the sweeping tide of revolutionary revolt? No!—scum always floats. It moves with the current. For the moment, these greedy and conscienceless persons inevitably assume that the all-powerful government must win. But what will happen when the slow impact of the nationalist cause overwhelms the rule of Englishmen? Why, these purchased wights will then desert as fast as they now rush to the trough. Not by such worthless elements of the population is any question settled. India is no coward, and will not be frightened by arms; she is no prostitute, and will not be bought by money. Here is new evidence that Britain is desperate.

The Asiatic situation has clarified itself. By this we mean that Japanese relations with China, their intent and purpose, have been revealed in all their terrible reality. So long as Japan limited her military operations to Manchuria, she had a case. But, with the best will in the world, we can find no case for Nippon at Shanghai and Nanking. Her mere presence there is an affront. Her assault upon these cities, with its attendant ruthlessness and horror, was an attack not only upon China but upon the peace and order of mankind as well. Her grim defiance of the League of Nations and other existing agencies and treaties of accord is an outrage upon the conscience of the race. We are back in the eras of barbarism again. The "next war" is at our threshold. Every hope and effort for human brotherhood are once more cast prone upon the dust. What may happen before these words find print, we cannot say, or even guess. The worst may have come, or have been ended. But whate'er betides, this much we may recall—that this war must not under any circumstances be met with war! This conflagration, already spread from Harbin to Chin-Chow, to the Great Wall, and now to Shanghai and Nanking, must not be allowed to engulf Asia, Europe, and the world. It must be stopped where it is. No further fuel, in the form of other arms, must be added to the flames. Whatever Japan has done, other nations are still pledged to the Covenant of the League. We are all bound to the terms of the Briand-Kellogg Treaty. We have renounced war "as an instrument of national policy"—which means that in our policy toward Japan

and China, war is forbidden *us!* Our one hope in this desperate situation is to prove that Japan can not, by her own solitary and wanton action, make "scraps of paper" of the pacts that hold mankind in the sacred bonds of peace. The Shanghai horror, in other words, is a challenge not to war but to peace. Looking back upon the last war, we have agreed that it must never be again. Looking forward upon what may well be the "next war," let us renew this solemn pledge. Here is the test of all our professions and all our pursuits during this last decade. It is now, or never! Peace must at this dreadful moment be vindicated, or else forever lost.

The danger of war today seems remote, in spite of all that has happened, or may yet happen, in the Far East. The same is true of Europe. What possible concatenation of circumstances could drag this country into a conflict of arms? Yet, from quite another point of view, this danger was never more immediate. If there were a wicked man in the White House, for example, what a temptation it would be to take the nation into war, and thus by the intoxication of arms make the administration as popular as it is now unpopular, and thus change what would seem to be a certain defeat in this year's election into a resounding victory. Even a weak man might be persuaded by mad counsellors to do this thing. But we cannot imagine Mr. Hoover conceiving or lending himself to such a conspiracy. Much more serious is the menace of the economic situation. It would seem as though a war were impossible anywhere today just because the world is too poor to pay for it. But that's the rub! For no remedy for industrial depression is quite so immediate and so effective as war. If the United States went to war with Japan, for example, every factory in the land would be open in three months, every unemployed man and woman would be employed, wages would be up, stocks and bonds would soar, prosperity would not be just around the corner, but *here*. This remedy for our economic ills would not last. Like alcohol, it would arouse the organism, only to have it fall into worse depression than ever. The prosperity of 1914-1918 is the one direct cause of the disaster of 1929-1932. War, like any other debauchery, has to be paid for in the end. But meanwhile, for a race of humans essentially short-sighted, living in the hour and never in the morrow, the temptation is apparent. It is so easy to drown our national troubles in blood, as it is so easy to drown our personal troubles in drink. In both cases we are making a bad case infinitely worse. But the peril, none the less, remains what it is. So there was never so great need for peace agitation as there is today. Fortunately, we have in the Disarmament Conference now meeting at Geneva a marvelous talking point. If this gathering of the nations does nothing else but give the pacifists a chance to preach their gospel and present their program, it is well worth while. We count upon delegates inside the Conference like Lord Cecil and Miss Woolley to lead the way, and the great masses of the common people outside the Conference to follow on. The chance of securing any substantial measure of disarmament at this hour would seem to be so small as to be actually invisible. But this is only the more reason for lifting up our voices and crying aloud. Pacifists of the world, unite! We have a world to gain, and nothing to lose but our hopes.

It is going to be interesting to see how the administration this year will evade the issue of federal relief of unemployment. This has been condemned as a demoralizing "dole"—though why relief passed out by Washington is demoralizing, and relief passed out by Boston or Syracuse or Keokuk is *not* demoralizing, is hard to see. But the President who, in his earlier and happier days administered not national relief merely but international relief to Belgians and Russians, no more hungry than Americans are now hungry, has set his face steadfastly against it. On the other hand is the grim fact that local relief cannot even begin to take care of the flood of misery now engulfing the nation. Charitable funds have been generously subscribed to, appropriations have been fittingly authorized by cities and towns, but still the money available to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and shelter the homeless, is tragically inadequate. In this testimony some weeks ago before the U. S. Senate, for example, Mr. William Hodson, executive director of the Welfare Council of New York City, declared flatly that relief needs due to unemployment cannot be met without the aid of federal funds. This opinion was echoed by charity experts from Chicago and Philadelphia as representing these communities. And if this is true of cities of great size and enormous wealth, what about the smaller and poorer cities and towns throughout the land? Mr. Hodson asserted that relief in New York was "on what might be called a disaster basis." How long do you want this "disaster basis" to continue, Mr. President? Is it your intention to go into the 1932 campaign with a "disaster" record behind you? With "the spectre of starvation facing millions who were never out of work before," to quote Mr. Hodson again, we are all for Senator La Follette's bill authorizing the appropriation of $250,000,000 for immediate allocation to states for relief work. This seems like a huge sum, especially in times like these. But how much money did we appropriate in 1917 not to keep Americans alive but to kill Germans?

We have long had sincere admiration for Newton D. Baker. He is a man of ability, character, and ideals —a rare type in the political life of America. It is true we deplored his abandonment of his pacifism in the

service of the War Department during the World War. We have regretted his more recent professional service of great corporation interests—so strange in the case of a man trained in the "Tom" Johnson school! But we still believed in and admired this man. Then came his recent interview on the League of Nations, universally interpreted by the newspapers as a direct bid for the presidency! This seemed to us to be a shocking statement. Once more, as Heywood Broun declared, we were taught that in politics a man had rather be a "candidate" than "candid." Never ourselves an enthusiast for the League, we have none the less believed that Newton D. Baker's untiring advocacy of the cause was one of the finest things in our contemporary public life. In season and out, he has urged the United States to enter the League. His appeal to this end at the Madison Square Garden convention of the Democratic Party (1924) will never be forgotten by those who heard it. So persistently, so regularly, did he acclaim the League of Nations that it became a legend that he had promised his chief, Woodrow Wilson, that he would never make a speech without referring to it. And now, right out of a clear sky, when all political experts agree that his advocacy of the League is the one perhaps insurmountable obstacle in the way of his nomination for the presidency on the Democratic ticket, he kicks the issue aside, and says that he would not insist upon his support of the League being written into the platform. His reasons are plausible and high-sounding, but just because of this fact do they smack of moral surrender. The whole episode is to us depressing. Why is it that men are not content to stand by principle, and let political preferment "go hang"?

Critical times in Germany have revealed many things—among others, the presence of a great statesman—Herr Bruening. This Chancellor of the Reich is a young man, considerably under fifty years of age. His gray hair, tired eyes, care-worn countenance make him appear much older than he really is. By birth and conviction he is a devout Roman Catholic, a pietist in his religious practises, and an ascetic in the habits of his daily life. His rise to eminence and power has been almost meteoric. During the War, he was an obscure officer in the trenches. Seven years ago, he made his first unimpressive speech in the Reichstag. Today he is the acknowledged successor of Stresemann, the outstanding leader of the German people, unquestionably the first statesman of western Europe. His ceaseless and tireless activity during the critical weeks of this past summer and early winter matched perfectly the wisdom of his judgment and the rigor of his will. He accomplished two things during those dreadful days which together seemed impossible. On the one hand he convinced America, Britain, even France, that his country was on the brink of ruin, and must be given instant help if she was to be saved. On the other hand he maintained the morale of the German people, and thus stayed the panic which would have precipitated universal disaster. That Germany and all of Europe have discovered the capacity of this man is perhaps the most hopeful sign on the horizon of European society today. Trusted, and given full cooperation, he may be able to hold the continent together amid the political and economic earthquakes which shake the fabric of its life. If we have any hope for Europe today, this hope is founded in Bruening whose courage, patience, humility, and steadfastness will put to shame the fatuousness of MacDonald, the hypocrisy of Briand, and the bluster of Mussolini. There is a place still for great men in the world. Bruening proves it!

The Prohibition Problem

Amid all the problems that are pressing upon the people of the United States for solution, that presented by Prohibition is by no means the least. Strangely enough, this is not primarily one which has to do with the consumption of liquor. It is rather with the relation of Prohibition to the fundamental structure of civilization.

No one can question but what the consumption of intoxicating liquor even in our larger cities has vastly decreased since the enactment of Prohibition. There is no question at all but what wage earners and their families are much better off under Prohibition. Walking through the poorer sections of any of our large cities, one is surprised by the number of high grade automobiles (thanks to the used-car market) standing before tenements and in alleys. The saloon as a corrupting social and political menace is gone. Whatever may be the political power of the bootlegger, it is not to be compared with the power that was exercised by the highly organized distillery and brewery industries prior to Prohibition. It is very easy, in terms of statistics, to prove certain social advantages which have accrued to the people of the United States as a whole which, if not due to Prohibition, are at least coincident with it.

As to the effect of alcohol upon the human race, there is no general agreement. And yet it cannot be denied that it has taken an awful toll of human lives both directly and indirectly. It seems a grave question whether the free use of alcohol can exist in an indus-

trial civilization in which the great majority of people are engaged in indoor occupations requiring the operation of machinery. Certainly no one would argue that alcohol is conducive to the operation of an automobile. It is undoubtedly true that one of the factors in the securing of Prohibition was the support of what is commonly called "big business." Industrial leaders were insisting more and more, prior to the war, on a sober laboring class. The railroad managers insisted that their employees should keep out of saloons.

But when all this is said, there still remains the tremendously important and vital problem which Prohibition presents. Aristotle said that a law has power only as it rests on the spirit of the people. A law which does not command the spontaneous support of the great mass of the population is, by virtue of this fact, a bad law. It is a fact that in America, thousands of people will vote for a law for which they themselves have no personal respect and which they do not intend to obey. It is beside the point to say that other laws besides that of Prohibition are generally disregarded. The prime question is, how many laws can a democracy have upon its statute-books which are generally disobeyed before the whole structure of society collapses. We are face to face in America not with a theory but with a very critical situation. The Prohibition law is so generally ignored that, in a very large portion of the United States, it is simply a joke. A prominent minister in one of our larger cities said recently that he could have some opinion about Prohibition if he had ever seen anything of it. A policeman, who is himself a life-long Prohibitionist, serving at the general headquarters of the police force of an eastern city where there is supposed to be at least an endeavor to enforce the law, said recently,

> I do not see how we can possibly enforce Prohibition, for one after another of the men selected for their integrity as head of the "liquor squad" have been corrupted.

Almost at the very time that he was saying this, the head of the "liquor squad" was being exposed as a corrupt and venal official, who, during his short term of office, had amassed an enormous sum of money. One of the leading editors of the United States, a man who voted for Prohibition and who for a number of years believed in Prohibition, has said that the general disregard of the law on the part of people of prominence and influence, forced him to the conclusion that the people of the United States must come face to face with the necessity if not of repealing the Prohibition Amendment, at least of a modification of the Volstead Law. Page after page could be filled with the reports of prominent and reliable people telling of the ease with which they secure all kinds of liquor.

There are some laws inconsiderately placed upon the statute-books which may be ignored without seriously affecting society as a whole. But it is very much to be doubted if society can stand the strain for a long period of the continuous open violation of a law that so closely touches the lives of people as that of Prohibition. This editorial is not an argument for or against Prohibition, but it is an attempt to say that, in spite of whatever may be the advantages of the abolishing of liquor, the present situation is one fraught with grave danger.

In a democracy, the state has no power but that given it by the citizens. The state may use physical force but only to such an amount and in such a manner as is permitted by public opinion. When the industrial, financial, social and political leaders continuously violate a law, there is no hope that public opinion will be created that will enable the enforcement of that law. When a prominent churchman and Prohibition leader calls upon the army and navy to enforce the law of the land, it simply reveals the fact that he does not understand the essential nature of a democracy.

At the present time there seems to be a very large majority of the creators of public opinion in America who are opposed to the return of the saloon. It would seem to be the wise thing at the present time for advocates of Prohibition to consent to the modification of the Volstead Act before it is too late. It appears certain that, when a generation grows up that knows not the saloon, they will be willing to face the issue of the repeal of Prohibition entirely. For many years before Prohibition the writer believed, that if the brewery interests would separate themselves from the distillers, their business might be saved. They finally attempted to do this in 1916, but it was too late. The Prohibitionists in America may wait until it is too late. They may, by refusing to listen to any suggestion for the modification of the Volstead Act, lose Prohibition altogether.

ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY.

Jottings

UNITY will have as its representative at the Disarmament Conference its distinguished co-editor, Dr. Sydney Strong. Letters from his pen, covering the course of events, will appear regularly in these columns.

There is not much to please us in the contemporary world. But we confess we get a satisfaction, grim but ecstatic none the less, as we watch American manufacturers struggling to persuade European governments to lower their tariff walls. Why don't we lower our

own tariff walls? There's an old saying which reads, "Do unto others as ye would that others should do unto you."

"Banketeers" is not a bad name for these bankers who have for years been running amuck in this country, floating worthless corporation securities, bad foreign bonds, and other respectable gold bricks. Racketeers, patrioteers, banketeers—these are all members of the same great American gang of thieves.

"Let's see,
Which party are we"

are the incomparable words of the opening chorus of national committeemen in the new satirical musical comedy, "Of Thee I Sing." A satire on political conditions naturally begins with an attempt to discover the difference between Republicans and Democrats.

Mahatma Gandhi has gained two pounds in prison. How aggravating a man—to defy his enemies, and then wax fat at their expense!

Theologians do wonderful things with words. But they are not in the same class, nor even in the same world, with statesmen and soldiers who can invade territory, capture cities, fight armies, bombard forts, bomb non-combatant populations, and pile up thousands of dead and wounded, and still say they are not at war.

J. H. H.

Our Great Responsibility

I have chosen for my talk this morning our Great Responsibility—choosing between world peace and another world war. Upon our choice in this momentous issue depends the future of America and of all countries. In the broadest sense, it is in the power of the peoples to bring about permanent peace and universal good-will.

It is for us to fix our minds on this tremendous fact and refuse to be turned aside by the argument that men have always fought, and will always fight. It is true that in 1815 the Holy Alliance was established to put an end to militarism, but instead of disappearing, armies and navies have grown more formidable—that is, because there has not been a consistent and intelligent education for peace.

The time to achieve peace is now. The way to succeed is to forget the past of fear and hate, to build up a powerful public opinion against war and prepare ourselves with all our might to live peaceably among the peoples of the earth.

We have had thirteen years of peace talk. A war-weary world has listened to endless promises, prophecies and understanding and accord, and what has come of it all? Pacts and protocols have been signed, and the governments are still increasing their armaments, piling debts upon debts in a mad effort to secure against attack.

Thirteen years ago millions of young men gave their lives for liberty and world security, and what is there to show for that appalling sacrifice? The greatest of wars ended disastrously for both victor and vanquished. The Peace Treaty at Versailles did not bring true peace, but laid the foundation for other wars. There are a million more soldiers in Europe today than at the beginning of 1914, and what security has Europe? It seems to me, the time has come to demand that the peace talk shall bear fruit in constructive action.

Before we can work effectively for peace, we must learn how wars are made, and what their causes are. Vagueness is the enemy of action and a great weapon in the hands of militarists. The causes are both political and economic. Let us try to grasp a few of the most important ones.

For instance, let us take the United States which has unlimited resources—sufficient to supply all the people with food, shelter, clothing, the means of decent living, education, security and happiness. There is no excuse for poverty and insecurity in a nation with such vast resources. Yet there is poverty, unemployment and insecurity in the United States. And these evils are not the fault of those who suffer from them. They result from a social order in which private profit, not service to the people, is the ruling factor, and from bad distribution and lack of proper arrangements which would make the resources available so as to meet the needs of everybody.

When captains of industry cannot, or will not make a proper division of earnings between labor and capital, economic unrest prevails, and a state of affairs arises like that which we are witnessing here and all over the world. When millions of people willing to work are idle and without the common necessities of life, there is more and more grumbling heard, more and more outspoken criticism of the inequalities of income and property ownership. Then those in power become alarmed, and "big business" looks about for a pretext to make war—and that is just what they are doing now.

If we are to head off this war, we must organize for peace. We must match our forces against those of the militarists. We must refuse to have anything to do with the production of munitions or armaments, or to take part in any war whatever.

For most wars are economic. They have their origin in the struggle between different countries for special advantages—favorably situated sea-ports, opportunities to exploit a backward people, raw materials such as rubber, oil, copper, financial supremacy, or control of the world's means of communication. Right now there is a terrific competition in radio equipment on both sides of the Atlantic. Each government is determined to be heard on the air and exclude the propaganda of every other. The British Radio Corporation has on its coat of arms this legend, "Nation shall speak peace unto nation." Friendship between all lands seems so naturally a message for the radio to carry that many rise up and call it blessed. But in reality more war than peace is being broadcasted. The new high-power stations erected along frontiers in Europe are monuments to fear as undeniably as chains of forts or arsenals. The lofty antennae fac-

ing each other seem to dispute the frontier in different languages. Stations re-concentrated wherever the boundaries were shifted after the Great War, or racial problems are difficult. It is incumbent upon us to see to it that radio broadcasting assumes its role as a source of international understanding and good-will. We need to check the propaganda that governments hostile to each other carry on in neutral lands, and cultivate instead an intense desire for the constructive arts, for the progress of science, a diminution of disease, and liberation of the impulses that create beauty and joy. As things are now, every increase of scientific knowledge brings the possible destruction of what order there exists today because it is utilized for war. It is a fact, my friends, that every historical cause of war exists between Great Britain and America today, and is being aggravated daily. Let us not be deceived by the assurance that war between those two sister lands is "unthinkable." Politicians said with equal positiveness before 1914 that war between Germany and Great Britain was unthinkable. Should we not brush aside all such idle phrases and insist on sincere preparedness for peace?

Whenever a conflict breaks out, each belligerent nation finds it an advantage to tell everybody that it was attacked. But defense is seldom the underlying cause of war. The newspapers play it up because it arouses the patriotism that is necessary to carry on. They talk about "better days coming," and assure us that all the disasters of the present will be righted by moratoriums and bank credits. In those "better days" other millions of young men will be slaying each other with all manner of machines and cruelties. The maimed, the blind, the insane will multiply until the future burden breaks the backs of unborn generations.

Ignorance of these matters is of great importance to rulers and politicians who spin the destinies of mankind. Because of this ignorance they know that wars will continue, and that they will profit by them. No, my friends, peace will not come through the League of Nations, where statesmen agree to scrap everything they won't need in the next war, or through the Disarmament Conference that is to be held at Geneva next February. Neither will it came through tariff walls and moratoriums. Why cannot the people see that the powers that be are trying to drive Russia into war with Japan because it would be easier for them to exploit China if there was an enemy nation between it and Russia?

A little reflection will, I think, show any intelligent person that we, the peoples, cannot leave the promotion of peace to our governments. As I have tried to explain, governments are founded on force, and to defend and extend their power, they inevitably resort to militarism. Already the War Department of the United States has plans for mobilizing four million men and equipping industry so as to supply them with provisions and ammunition, and submarines are being launched on every coast as fast as labor can produce them. Look with your own eyes, read the newspapers with attention, and you will see the network of deadly combat and horror that is being drawn about us under the mask of disarmament, the Federation of Europe and measures for business recovery.

We, the peoples, must learn to cooperate more closely in striving for peace. We must make up our minds once for all that peace, permanent peace, means sacrifice for everybody. If we are to prevent future wars, we must give up imperialism, we must give up empires and all ambition for domination. That means that England will have to come out of India, the French out of North Africa, the Americans out of the Philippines and Porto Rico, and leave Cuba, Mexico and Nicaragua alone. We must give up spheres of influence and keys to trade routes. Those are some of the sacrifices that the dominant nations will have to make. I repeat, peace, permanent peace means sacrifice. We must take a determined stand on these principles if we are to avert the greatest danger that has yet threatened America and the rest of the world.

No one who studies the actions of the governments since the Armistice can fail to perceive that they learn nothing from experience. Practically the same governments carried on the most destructive of wars, and continued to function through the peace travesty and the revolution in Russia, and have they changed their attitude? No, they still cling to their armaments, their prejudices, their chauvinism. They see civilization imperilled, and they sidetrack every effort to put an end to the armed peace, which is nothing but war in suspense. They continue to line their frontiers with underground fortifications, to build larger air forces and store up unimaginable quantities of deadly gases.

The sacrifices made by the peoples in the World War will be redeemed only when we achieve a new international morality, a new code of social conduct, a reorientation of individual faith and aspiration.

The thing for us to do now with all our might is to work for international cooperation. The things to work against are tariff walls and preparedness for war and the prejudiced manner of teaching history in the schools and colleges.

In our lives and attitudes towards each other we must be careful not to foster hatred and enmity between our children and the children of other lands. In all educational institutions it must be impressed upon the students that peace and good-will between the nations are conditions essential to further progress. Children everywhere must learn that true patriotism is a sense of responsibility for the welfare of one's fellows, and a desire to do something to enrich the life of the community. They must be made to feel that heroes in the work for peace exist and that heroism for peace is the highest courage. They will have to be taught history, not as a record of kings and generals, but rather as a narrative of men in all lands who have triumphed over chaos and the forces of nature without and darkness within. Children also need to be encouraged in arts and creative activity of every kind. This will tend to develop a generation with a greater variety of interests and fine ambitions, less bored, less deluded by the idea that war and excitement lead to interesting adventure and satisfaction.

I would suggest the appointment of a board of trustworthy men and women to investigate the teaching of history in the schools and colleges of all countries, especially those of England and Sweden, where I believe the principles of permanent peace are being taught, and to report the effects of this teaching as shown in the spirit, intelligence and happiness of the children.

Is this all a dream? History tells us how the colony founded by William Penn in 1682, unlike the other colonies, lived peaceably with the Indians for seventy years. William Penn gave this pledge: "We use no weapons against our enemies, except only good

faith and good-will towards men. We believe you will deal kindly and justly with us, as we will deal justly and kindly with you. No advantage shall be taken on either side, but all shall be openness and love." The Indians promised that they would "transmit this league between us to our children. It shall be made stronger and stronger, and be kept bright and clean, without rust or spot between our children and our children's children while the creeks and rivers run, and while the sun, moon and stars endure." And both sides remained faithful to their covenant during seventy years.

Once King William I transferred the government of the Penn colony to Colonel Benjamin Fletcher who tried to force them into preparedness for war. But they refused, and four years later, 1694, the government was restored to William Penn. Yes, we too can resist war successfully if we only believe we can.

The world is in great need of a peace formula vitalized with a supreme purpose. There must be less negative and more positive thought, less hypocrisy and more sincerity. The formula must be short, it must be a flash of light in darkness. It must have in it the spirit of the Golden Rule, "Do unto others as ye would have men do unto you."

We have war medals and decorations. Why not have medals and decorations for those who show talent, imagination and initiative in peace promotion? The world will never be made prosperous and contented again by the application of old formulas. Again I say to you, the nation that thinks it can have prosperity at the cost of another nation, that it can enjoy peace and security by force and exclusion, is still living in the fools' paradise before the War.

Permanent peace and prosperity will come when we realize that we live by each other and for each other and not unto ourselves. We need to renew our whole spiritual vision.

Won't all here cast their influence on the side of human liberation, social and spiritual? Then you will be contributing most to the enduring peace and glory of your country. Let us all turn our backs on the blood-soaked path by which we came, and face towards peace; for thus alone can our feet be lighted along the roadway of the future.

HELEN KELLER.

Kingsley Hall—The Home of Fellowship

[Editorial Note: This article, written by a citizen of India, will be of great interest to our readers as describing the settlement house in which Mahatma Gandhi lived during the entire period of his visit to London on the occasion of the meeting of the second Round Table Conference. The Mahatma came to Kingsley Hall at the invitation of its head, Miss Muriel Lester, who had met Gandhi in India and visited his *Ashram*. Miss Lester is the author of a notable book entitled, "My Host the Hindu."

It was at Kingsley Hall that I visited Gandhi when I met him in London in September last. This simple settlement house, thronged with happy people and led by an impressive group of devoted men and women, has been sanctified anew by Gandhi's presence, and is destined to be preserved through future years as a shrine of remembrance.—J. H. H.]

Kingsley Hall, London, has become the center of stupendous interest owing to its recent association with the name of Gandhiji. It is the great achievement of its saintly Christian founder, Miss Muriel Lester, and the story of the steady growth of the institution from a humble twelve-foot-square room in one of the desolate corners of London into a model work-house in the Bow is unique in its interest.

About the year 1914, a half-dozen workmen met together and decided to thrash out the implications of the teachings of Jesus Christ in everyday life. A small room was acquired by pulling down the partition wall between the two rooms of a workman's dwelling. The next year witnessed rapid improvement, and soon the dark and dismal place was turned into a light, airy, and open house for the neighbors and became a center of life in that area. It was not until the year 1918, however, immediately after the Armistice that Kingsley Hall extended its beneficent activities to a wider circle and attracted keener interest by awakening public opinion to alleviate the pitiful condition of the half-starved children of central Europe, who had been reduced to absolute misery by the ravages of the war. The work was accomplished through visits by ministers and members of Parliament, by organizing demonstrations, and by despatching food and clothing to these millions of suffering humanity. The history of the institution after the War is one of constant expansion and steady growth. About the year 1923, the Children's House was opened by Mr. H. G. Wells, and it soon developed into a model because of its nursery school and the flat-roof playground. In recent years the present Hall has grown in dimension and power, and is today one of the greatest monuments of the teachings of Christ.

The activities of Kingsley Hall are as varied as that of any university, but it is greater in one respect that it is a church, a fellowship of people who have definitely set out to interpret the laws of the Kingdom in a work-a-day life. It has a social club and also an educational policy. The activities of the inmates are purely humanitarian. Their task is essentially one of bringing about a moral and spiritual exhilaration in the neighborhood. A group of these inmates—working people—set out preaching to the crowds, in the name of common brotherhood, to wage a fearless war against war. They rescue the helpless girl at the brothel, restore the nameless child, or mitigate the misery of house tenants who may suffer from inequity at the hands of a greedy landlord. This, in general, is the type of work in which they engage themselves, and they do it with such pleasant cheer and faith that their noble efforts usually succeed in their fulfilment.

The rules of life in Kingsley Hall are as rigorous as in an Indian *ashram*. The inmates keep only 5 shillings a week for their clothes, and 2 shillings for their pocket money. They ignore barriers of nation, creed or class, and look on every human being as an integral part of a great brotherhood. The most impressive practice at Kingsley Hall, however, is that of prayer. Each of the inmates spends at least half an hour a day in silent prayer. They have no superfluities and live on minimum needs of subsistence.

In the evenings the club wears a gay and cheerful appearance with its cards, billiards, darts, debates and dancing, followed by lively conversation on all sides. Distinguished public men are invited every week-end to deliver some lecture. "Joy-nights" are a recent innovation. The gaiety, the good fellowship and the carefree joy that is manifest on these nights is a wonderful thing.

On Sundays a meeting of the two households, the Children's House and Kingsley Hall, is held for morning worship. The girls group themselves in the afternoon and provide their own tea and conversation. The Sunday service in the evening is the source of all that is best in Kingsley Hall.

Kingsley Hall is in every way an ideal Christian home and a great center of fellowship in the midst of a large industrial neighborhood.

L. N. GUBIL.

Notes from Geneva*

Geneva. Famous for her huge Reformation Monument to the great Calvin, Knox and company; also as the seat of the temple to the Unknown God of Peace, whom the people in ignorance seek. Here is a great call for some modern Paul to come along with the declaration, "What therefore ye worship in ignorance, this I set forth unto you."

Seeing a priest on the street. Authority, power, privilege — not love.

American tourists—too noisy and talkative; demand fewer comforts than they get at home. *British* tourists—too exclusive and snobbish; demand more comforts than they get at home.

Switzerland will have taken a preliminary step toward disarmament when she abolishes conscription.

America and *Britain* will have taken preliminary steps toward disarmament when they are willing to affirm the freedom of the seas; to dismantle their military bases (like Honolulu and Singapore); and, turn Suez and Panama into free and unfortified gates of commerce. Before doing this, their words will sound like "the voice of Jacob."

Einstein's 2% button—symbol of the conscientious objector to war—has more meaning than the cross, which has become a badge of privilege. The wearer of the button may find it transformed into a cross. A button may be obtained from *The Arbitrator,* 114 31st street, N. Y. C.

*This article begins a series of "Notes From Geneva," which we hope to publish at short intervals through the next few months, written by our co-editor and special representative, Dr. Strong.—Editor.

Sanitary communion. Individual communion cups came into use in America for sanitary reason, not scriptural. In fact, the individual cup is rather contrary to the "example." The Anglican church (as I found in a little mountain village in the Alps) has sought to preserve the letter of scripture and the spirit of sanitation by the practice of "intinction," i. e. the communicant dips the wafer in the chalice, and administers in both kinds at the same time. Great is the power of compromise.

"A curse to the world!" The Bishop of Chichester says, "Nationalism is one of the great curses in the world today." The nationalist wants to get something for his own nation at the expense of other nations. Patriotism is different. All the forces of nationalism will be at work to prevent the Disarmament Conference from succeeding. It is for Christians to beg the nations to make a new start, and look at the whole problem of disarmament from the point of view of the world, not that of the individual nation." . . . The bishop seems to lack a sense of humor. What about imperialism covering the world?

A New Vatican. Is a new political Vatican growing up at Geneva, with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations as chief Cardinal?

The Bad Boy.

Who is the "villain" in the
Disarmament Play?
Not me, Not me,
Says A. B. F. and G.

Proposal for the Disarmament Conference, Geneva

Make the disarmament of Germany the standard. It is proposed that all the nations shall disarm down to the level of Germany. This will be the basis for discussion, the goal for action. . . . Argument for the proposal;

1. Germany's disarmament has been regarded as nearly perfect. It was done by friends of the League of Nations, and with its approval.

2. It was done within three months after the signing of the Treaty. Hence, there need be little delay. Experts in disarmament have been in training, and therefore stand ready to do an effective operation in disarmament surgery.

3. Such disarmament of the nations is not only consistent with "national safety" but will increase such safety. Equality is the one element that creates the proper mentality to secure safety. If the nations were equalized down to Germany's level, the prospects for world peace would be bright.

4. If this is not done, Germany (including Austria and others) will strive to arm up to the level of the armed powers. Neither the Treaty nor moral law would seem to deny them this right. This would be a world-calamity.

5. Who has a better proposal for the Disarmament Conference? Thus far, comparatively little progress has been made in securing disarmament. Substantial progress cannot be expected, unless there is set up the standard of disarmament of the defeated Powers.

Only one thing would be better, and that is Total General Disarmament—which same could be done within a year, if the nations meant business—a year of *action,* with a moratorium on *words.*

Respectfully submitted,

SYDNEY STRONG.

The Pope intimates that he acts in the capacity of "sole moderator of conscience." Suppose the problem of disarmament were left to him, I wonder what he *would do* as expressed in concrete facts. I also wish that the Archbishop of Canterbury would try his hand at it, and state exactly what he *would do*. Papers would be glad to publish.

Manchuria. What have some of the big nations now working over the problem of the rape of Manchuria to gain? I mean the big nations of the West. Much every way. They will succeed in dividing Asia (as a preliminary to conquest). They will take away Japan's commerce with China. They will have succeeded in setting up a guard on Russia. They will have drawn away attention from other conquests, like that of India. They will reenforce the Council of the League as a weapon of exploitation of weaker peoples. The division of Asia by the West is such a pity. When will the East get wise to this card game of politics and cruelty?

Established churches of all breeds have one hand bathed in the blood of women and children and the "saints." "It is more profitable that one of thy members be cut off than that thy whole body be cast into hell."

The Foreign Policy of the big powers follows the scriptural injunction to "let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth: that it may be in secret."

Will be War. A friend writes that he is convinced that "nothing effective will be done about the abolition of war until we bring about fundamental changes in the economic setup. Russia is the one country that can afford honestly to offer complete disarmament because she does not have a ruling class which in the long run can perpetuate its own power internally only by military forces." There is much soundness in his argument. Still, I feel certain that even under the present economic system, individuals and nations may keep out of war—since it has already been done.

Soviet Russia will again present her proposition for general disarmament. And, America, Britain and company will doubtless again show that they are not sincere in desire for real disarmament. How schoolgirlish America is in her attitude toward a nation bigger than herself. Some day—when deserted by present allies—America may need the friendship of Russia.

The Buchman Movement. A group of revivalists, called the "Oxford Group," has just closed ten days of "house-meetings" in Geneva. They run on a schedule of three meetings a day. The reader is doubtless familiar with this movement which has an American origin, but which, according to report is spreading over the British Empire. I attended three of the meetings. They reminded me some of the C. E. meetings which I attended years ago, in that everybody is expected to "take part." Also, of the old-fashioned Methodist experience meeting, when people were expected to make a clean breast about life, in a kind of fellowship of confession. I could not make out why the movement had appropriated the name of "Oxford." It doubtless has more carrying power than the name of the founder—and, then, the appeal is to youth. There is an element of Quakerism in it from its encouragement to enter into the "silence." The leader said there were three elements to notice: sincerity, brevity, hilarity. They try to reverse the old order of coming to laugh and staying to pray, by coming to pray and staying to laugh. The movement is sure to spread. How long it will last, and how deep go is quite problematic. The bishops approve of it, which may be doubtful approbation. Its entire emphasis is upon individual salvation. The experiences could be duplicated in the Salvation Army, many times over—but the meetings are held in fashionable hotels and homes instead of in the slums. In their testimonies, the members seem to fight shy of problems like war, imperialism and racial equality—and dwell upon personal habits all the way from smoking to purity, also upon family matters. Those who are converted to the Christian way generally go back to the Church and become useful members. It strikes me as a kind of religious Rotary movement. There is a similar kind of good comradeship. So far, it is a kind of white man's quest after clean living and comfort. Much reference was made to the visit of a group to South Africa, and of the great impression made upon the clergy, business men—but, I could detect very little that will help to break down the white man's dominion over his fellow black man. Will the movement just prepare British youth to make better soldiers, when the bugle calls? I was thinking of Gandhi. He was once in South Africa, and was denied entrance to a white man's church. Has the Oxford group changed the atmosphere down there? Or, is it a white man's movement?

Why so long? It looks now as if the Disarmament Conference would last several months—with a few intermissions. Why so long? The question, To disarm or not to disarm, could be settled in a short time. The process of disarming Germany took only three months. Nearly every nation is saying that its arms are down to the limit, as compared with other nations. If there is a desire to disarm, it can be easily and quickly done. . . . Who can think of a better and more practical way than to disarm down to the level of Germany?

And there will be women in the Conference. This is all to the good. They would make more impression, if there were an even hundred of them. President Woolley will make herself felt. Being the daughter of a Congregational minister, she might remember what one can do. If she has the faith of a grain of mustard-seed, she will be able to remove Mt. Blanc. She might do worse than to rise and read the words of French women to German women in 1919:

> After those accursed years, we desire reconciliation of spirit. Women of the conquered nations, with you we demand a true peace, a peace without violence, a peace without reprisals, a peace, at last, of disarmament. . . . Our community of suffering, the death of husbands and brothers and sons, has rendered us like one another.

Titles. The more men and women of titles—lords, barons, viscounts, admirals—at the Disarmament Conference, the less the chance for disarmament! The reason is plain. These titles are sustained by the sword. Each title is actually a "court of arms."

Permanent Disarmament Commission. Disarma-

ment is an excellent thing. The completer, the better. It cannot be made too general or drastic. But, a Permanent Disarmament Commission to *control* the nations is quite another thing. This will bear watching. There are nations, among the big powers, that will be quite content if such a Commission is secured. Equipped with such a Commission and with membership in the Council of the League, a couple of the big powers could, like Rome, from their Genevan throne of beauty, rule the world. Some of the statesmen are more anxious to gain this Permanent Commission than to gain disarmament. It should be challenged.

In the Alps. I spent two weeks at Montana, in the Alps. Impossible to find a more charming place, for scenery, accommodations and all that makes up a holiday. Glad to find I could skate again nicely after, lo, these many years! I once thought, that anyone, amidst mountains, could write poetry. Mistake. Who can name many mountain-grown poets? Daughter and I had the pleasure of calling on Romain Rolland and sister, as we came down from the mountains. They live in a house beside the road, and radiate sweetness, light and inspiration all over the earth.

Geneva, Switzerland. SYDNEY STRONG.

Old Methods—New Spirit

"Jude the Obscure," one of Hardy's famous characters, aspired to the ministry. He was extremely sincere, loved truth and beauty, and knew his Latin prayers by heart. His fame traveled before him as one who could recite them faultlessly even backwards. The thought and vision of Oxford, its great theologians, living and dead, its accumulated wealth of books and manuscripts, stirred his depths and fired his imagination. There he would find peace. The very opposite is the truth. So little was he versed in life's forces, so blind to the actual struggling of his fellow beings, so inept in coping with the conditions and social demands of his day, that his life and that of those nearest and dearest to him, saw an early, messy, tragic end. Life, its needs, its fears, its complexities motivating his fellows left his imagination untouched.

Quite the contrary is the story of the life and achievements of Billy Sunday—doubtless he knows the Lord's prayer, having drunk it in with his mother's milk. He may even be able to conjugate "Amo." Neither fact has played a great role in his phenomenal success and influence. He had no training for the ministry, but had won fame as a professional baseball player. As such he knows the importance of the body, of care and lack of care, of temperance and self-control and of lack of same; the strength of teamwork, cooperation and the disruptive poison inherent in pure, personal ambition; the whip of competition and how fearsome natures indulge in dishonest and disloyal acts which pay the price of failure and shame to cleverer rascals, and both eventually to the light of truth. He knew life as it was being lived. He knew the pitfalls and he knew the havens. He could point to the paths that led to either. He personified, in himself, success in struggle. Vital, virile, vivid, he spoke a human language. He rarely left a hearer (and they numbered in the thousands) untouched in some chord. His exhortations, in language most unacademic, have corralled more souls into the Kingdom of Heaven than can be credited to the combined efforts of many of the most learned theologians of the day.

Our day is not interested in dogma, in the essence of angels, in the refined and isolated quintessence of our souls. We meet life more frankly and courageously. We look it straight in the face, accept its demands unsqueamishly, recognize the glory and the wonder, and the joy-giving power of every one of nature's devices and laws. We have gotten an insight into the interdependence of every part of our being; of the finely adjusted relationship between spirit and body, of the absolute dependence of our acts upon the sanity of both. We have gone further. We have perceived the perfect economy in every manifestation of life, small or big, and the complete union in proper time and form and place with its related parts. We have also realized the converse—every manifestation of ill health or evil is the result of disregard of the existence of these finely adjusted relationships.

We no longer believe in "Man conceived in sin." Nor does the theory of natural wickedness persist among the enlightened. If an infant cries; if youth strays from the normal path; if an adult commits a crime, we do not in a sweep of righteous anger or justice shout "Off with his head." We study the case. We seek the causes for the aberration, and despite the dim light that is yet ours, in spite of the inadequacy of our tools, despite the sad inflexibility of our attitudes and institutions, we have made tremendous strides in salvaging human lives from unhappiness and wickedness. We have learned that a mere dead tooth harboring at its root a painless pus bag may be pouring poisons into the whole system, thus irritating particularly some nerve center, which in its turn produces most unexpected effects upon human acts and relations. Even a thorough examination of the physical, emotional and intellectual reactions disclose no disease, until the X-ray sheds its light upon the trouble. Out with the tooth, and sweetness and sanity are restored. A mere unhappy judgment, a misconception too deeply rooted in one's consciousness can play havoc. The psychoanalyst clears that away and releases sound forces. Thus much have we done for the individual, and more. May it not be just to suppose that the same spirit applied to the group or nation may help us to understand our present unhappy condition and show us the way to better days?

The great urge today is toward Nationalism; the great need is for Internationalism. The two are not antagonistic. The latter includes the former. The two complete each other, perfect each other, make possible a bigger, richer, fuller life for the individual, the nation, the world. As yet, however, these truths sit but lightly in the consciousness of the world. The labor before us is to deepen that consciousness by clarifying these truths, by showing that however great and rich a cultural and physical heritage of a people may be, it is yet small and poor compared to what the world has to offer in its several and combined capacities. The part may be perfect in its small way, the heart, the lungs, the liver, the organs, but it is the great interac-

tion of every part, organ, force of the body that makes the fine, healthy individual. Perfection of the part, the highest ideals of Nationalism; free intercourse and interaction of all the component and equally important parts—the realization of the highest internationalism. We are far away from either. We do not quite clearly understand the forces that make for Nationalism and Internationalism; the great human hungers and fears stilled or roused by either or both; the great causes of national disease buried deep in a people's subconsciousness and due to removal inhibitions. We must study the part and envisage the whole. We can no longer think that we understand a people if we know its language, its art, or its philosophy. That is but a single isolated manifestation of its spirit. We cannot, when we see trouble, cut out the apparently ailing part. It may be only the outpost signalling graver, hidden sources of disease. We must look at all the conditions under which they developed and realize how the physical affected the spiritual development, and vice versa. Nor can we afford to ignore the currents of air that came from afar and left their impress upon growth. Since the days the Phoenicians began to sail and the Nomads to wander, there has been no absolute cultural isolation on earth; no hundred per cent pure race; just one hundred per cent pure humanity—groping its way from *ape* to *man*. We are not finished yet. We can help or retard the arrival of the Godly *man*, as preached by the great religious teachers Confucius, Buddha, Moses, and Christ, by accepting or refusing the new conditions, the new spirit. We will thereby only be making our days happier, for evolution is patient and sure, and goes on its way unflurried and unconscious of time. Only our day is limited. Let us make it as sound, as sane, as rich, as worthy a contribution as can result from obedience to the great laws of being perceived by the inspired teachers long ago, and formulated by scientists now. We cannot ignore the new conditions; we cannot be deaf to the new spirit. We must discard habits and methods that have served their day, and in the light of later science, work out our salvation with the new tools, the new knowledge at our command.

ESTHER LOWE GORDON.

The Study Table

War!

Of the authors of these three books, one is an American, E. Alexander Powell; one a Swede, Major K. A. Bratt; and the third is a German, Theodore Plivier.

The general theme of the books is war. Powell's "Thunder Over Europe" gives the political and racial tensions threatening war in Europe; Major Bratt's "That Next War?" presents some of the general conditions under which a possible future war will be fought; and Plivier's realistic novel, "The Kaiser's Coolies," gives vivid scenes and brutal experiences of the fighters in the war of 1914 to 1918.

International relations in Europe, strained before the great war, were not improved by the outcome of that conflict. Some countries who hoped to gain, notably Germany, had to stand great losses. Countries fought over, France, Poland, Russia, went through experiences which, combined with other factors, drove them insane. France went insane. Poland went insane. Since the war these two countries have acted in such heathenish ways as to leave little doubt of the effects of modern warfare on the mental and spiritual condition of men.

The "peace" treaties negotiated at the end of the war registered an attempt to satisfy the supposedly victorious countries at the expense of the losers. The implied philosophy was that by taking their colonies, resources, and compelling them to pay large reparations they would be punished for their "war guilt" and so weakened as to be unable to make war again. But all this has not given any lasting satisfaction to the victors who gathered in the spoils, and has produced bitterness and resentment on the part of Germany, Austria, and Bulgaria, as described in Powell's illuminating volume.[1]

Focal centers of tension are first the deep and lasting psychoses of France and Poland, endeavoring to carry through the terms of the peace treaties. Germany finds it impossible to pay reparations except by borrowing from the payees. This borrowing from Peter to pay Peter leaves him wondering where after all he is going to get "his money."

Germany, cut in two by the Polish Corridor, wants it back. Lithuania and Germany, losing territory to Poland, become hostile towards Poland and towards France, who supports Poland.

In the Balkans, always a disturbed region, relations are at least as bad as before the war. Italy spent enormously and suffered greatly in the war. Her rewards were poor. She feels the need of colonies, taken from Germany by England, France, and Japan.

The picture of chaos and discord, the crazy quilt of Europe, presented in this book, makes it a masterpiece of political writing. "Thunder over Europe" lets us hear the rumblings and explosions which precede the storm, another terrible and devastating conflict.

After reading Powell we question the need of the question-mark at the end of the title of Major Bratt's contribution.[2] President Butler, introducing it, states that it has been a best seller in Sweden, where it appeared in 1929. The author is cautious, wherever he feels his information to be limited, but within those limits courageous in presenting historical evidence pointing to the nature of combat in that next war.

An interesting conclusion is that the Allies' plans for the campaign of 1919 indicate the next development of strategy. "This decision," he says, "to make war on the whole population behind the front—is the most important experience of the world-war." This is the new strategy, "attack from the air on the undefended towns and industrial centers."

This is "the road to annihilation." By a gradual historical process the civil population has become increasingly involved in war.

> The world-war . . . . absorbed the whole apparatus of production for war preparation, and placed a large part of industry in the direct service of war. In the process the non-

1. "Thunder Over Europe." By E. Alexander Powell. Ives Washburn, New York. 1931.

2. "That Next War?" By Major K. A. Bratt. Harcourt Brace and Company, New York. 1931.

combatants, the workers in factories, women and children, were also engaged: the man in the steel-works, the girl who stamped the fuses, who rinsed the cartridge shells, who stood at the loom or in the preserve factory. All of these assumed the same relation, in principle, to the war as the soldier in the trenches. The French law extending obligation to service to the whole nation, irrespective of age or sex, codifies this development. . . . The last stage is reached when the new warfare regards the whole population and its economic resources as the objective of war. . . . The air arm is the architect in this new society; the constructor who, by virtue of his power of destruction, determines its type.

And so the horrible fascinating story goes on. The author generously elaborates interesting themes, indicated as chapter headings: The Fight for the Air Fortresses, Red and Black Fascism, The Illusion of the Pacifists, and Pan-Europe, the United States of Europe, the World Federation. In any "book-of-the-year" contest this book and Powell's would deserve high rank. Both are provided with indices, which make them valuable for reference.

Plivier's novel,[3] translated by Margaret Green, is a prose poem of mad death in ships staggering under the direct hits of enormous armor-piercing shells. Turrets exploding; a thousand men, human souls in agony, going down with a ship.

What the newspaper account doesn't tell!

The "Lion" was ablaze. Thick smoke was emitted from the "Tiger." One turret was put out of action on the "Seydlitz"—eighty men died a bloodless death, leaving no mournful remains. When the jet of flame subsided, soft black flakes floated down.

Strange new forms of death, weird, uncanny, machine-made, wholesale; portrayed by this author with amazing skill.

The lives of the Kaiser's Coolies—the seamen, the gunmen—given sharply, briefly, in a few strokes, but with keen sympathy and appreciation of their human feelings. Many simple personalities passing in review; in port, at home, on ship-board. Some in old unseaworthy hulks, resurrected from German ship-cemeteries at the beginning of the war, slow, vulnerable, perishing quickly with their crews of scores and hundreds, sacrificed to this modern Moloch, this furious, torturing demon.

Unless you are tough-minded you cannot read this book through at one sitting. It is too painful, horrible, brutal, indecent; too accurate a portrayal of war in its naked ugliness. . . .

Then remember that according to our Swedish friend, Major Bratt, the entire civil population of warring nations will have to undergo these tortures in that next war, which Powell makes seem inevitable.

How can civilization survive?

Where can life remain sane and wholesome if we have to go through this crucifixion of all mankind?

HERBERT A. STURGES.

3. "The Kaiser's Coolies." By Theodore Plivier. Alfred A. Knopf, New York. 1931.

Correspondence

What Are the Naval Committees For?

Editor of UNITY:

The recent performances at both the House and Senate Naval Committees hearings in Washington prompt the question as to what the real purpose of these committees is. Presumably their function is impartial consideration of the conditions of our navy and of the country's real naval problems. Actually their paramount concern seems to be the promotion of the "big navy" movement. The plain people would like to know why it is that extremists in this reactionary program are always chosen as chairmen for these naval committees, instead of conservatives in naval matters or men who have real sympathy with the new international order. Congressman Britten of Illinois, who has been the Republican chairman of the House Naval Committee for years, is one of the most rabid apostles in the country of the "biggest navy ever," kept in decent check by the sanity of Chairman French of the Naval Appropriations Committee; and Congressman Vinson of Kentucky, who succeeds Mr. Britten under the new Democratic organization, sets out to eclipse him by the proposal of a building project involving over $600,000,000. Whether or not Mr. Britten, still the ranking Republican in the committee, thinks his Democratic successor "playing for position" in this election year by this pandering to the "big navy" crowd, it is too much even for him, and he counters by urging a much more modest program.

Meantime Senator Hale, the chairman of the Senate Naval Committee, who has held that position almost immemorially by a kind of entail, is not at all staggered by Mr. Vinson's $600,000,000 building program. He thinks we should hasten to build our navy up to the maximum permitted by the London treaty of 1930, so that it would be in nothing inferior to the British navy, and completely intimidating to Japan, whose strong navy scares him. Indeed, no such scare has found expression at Washington since Senator Lodge's vivid imagination and paralyzing fear landed 200,000 Japanese on the west coast of Mexico headed for us. Even the president of the Navy League, who charged President Hoover with "abysmal ignorance" of "what our navy is for," advertised no fear of Japan. It is the British navy which scares him. He devoted a quarter of his lurid pamphlet to picturing what might happen to us in case of war with England if President Hoover's idea of the immunity of food-ships from capture were adopted for the sake of suffering non-combatants. He forgets that Franklin and Jefferson urged the same thing as far back as 1785, only went much further than Mr. Hoover.

The significant and novel thing about these naval hearings has been that instead of being conducted, according to tradition and propriety, for the sake of getting testimony and discussion from conspicuously qualified men representing various points of view, they have been turned by the committees and their chairmen into occasions for booming a bigger navy, "second to none." The hearing conducted by Senator Hale seems to have been almost entirely occupied by himself in a long harangue on the Japanese terror. He did get from Secretary Adams of the Navy Department, who was present, confirmation of his notion that not much was to be expected from the Geneva Conference, but that notice of a big building program on our part would increase our "bargaining power." This idea of "bargaining" as the chief tool and reliance at Geneva, the meanest of motives, is the paramount and orthodox idea in these Washington naval circles. No magnanimity, no prophecy, no brave or broad look forward.

Why is it that these Naval Committees have called to their hearings only "big navy" boomers? The hearings began six weeks ago, but so far as reports go only admirals and their associates have been heard, and of these only such as are known to have no confidence in the new international order. Why is not a man like Admiral Sims called? The country would take some interest in hearing a brainy man of his experience and quality. It was not edified by the performance of Admiral Pratt, who, asked, quite improperly, whether he thought anything of importance was to be expected from the Geneva Conference, replied, quite improperly, but "emphatically" said the report, "No." Improperly, because at this hour the President of the United States, his commander-in-chief, is profoundly concerned in the International Disarmament Conference for the drastic reduction of all armaments; and at such a time all admirals and their ilk, seldom accused or suspected of being statesmen, should at least hold their tongues.

Why, meantime, are not the Peace leaders of the country making themselves heard at these naval hearings in Washington? We have not read that they have been

invited like the admirals; but these are public Congressional hearings. The country would like to read some ringing words from Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, the head of the Carnegie Peace Endowment, from Dr. Macdonald of the Foreign Policy Association, from Professor Blakeslee of the World Peace Foundation, from George W. Wickersham, president of the League of Nations Association, and a few other men of that stripe. It might dissipate some of the present Washington fog. A keen New York publicist recently said with much warrant that ideas arrive in Washington a year and a half behind enlightened public opinion throughout the country. The duty of the enlightened men and women of the country at this hour, individually and through their associations, is to make themselves heard at Washington today. Secretary Adams, now pretty effectually controlled by the naval sentiment at Washington, who gave the Vinson bill his blessing because it promised a navy "second to none," intimated at one of the recent hearings that that bill was in essential accord with the Administration's policy. President Hoover at this moment expressly declares in a public statement that he does not wish to see the Vinson bill, the Britten bill, or anything like them adopted. The incongruity of such action with our mission to Geneva is obvious and glaring.

Our duty of leadership at the Geneva Disarmament Conference was too tamely expressed by Secretary Stimson in his reported instructions to our delegates. Our obligations to the most advanced leadership are paramount. We are the sponsors of the Kellogg Peace Pact, adopted at our behest by practically all the nations of the world, renouncing war and pledging the settlement of all international disputes by peaceful means. The provision of such peaceful means, the agencies of international law and justice, are now so complete that any resort to force is without excuse, and will not be sanctioned by the public opinion of the world. The clear corollary of the Peace Pact is the radical and rapid supplanting of the old agencies by the new; and it is clearly the vocation of our Government to take the brave leadership in this supplementing and implementing of the Kellogg Pact at Geneva. This is what the country must now say to Washington with power.

BRADLEY STONE

Boston, Massachusetts.

Motion Pictures

Editor of UNITY:

In the November 2, 1931 issue of your publication you carried an interesting article "Motion Pictures and America's Good Name" by Lucia Ames Mead. This article points out the harm done to America's good name abroad by the cheap motion pictures which we export. How about the harm done to the youth of our own country? Statistics show that young people especially tend to imitate the things they see portrayed on the screen. If we are looking for the cause of our crime increase, let us look, as one contribution at least to the gangster pictures with which the market has been flooded.

The article above mentioned spoke of the Twentieth Century Club of Boston which was reported to have "created a special committee" to "study the real services and possibilities of the motion picture, campaign against abuses and work for the best ways to check the evil which we are doing to other nations and to our own good name among them." About a month ago, I wrote to the Twentieth Century Club asking for information as to what the Committee was doing and also inquiring whether their organization would be interested in helping to forward an organization which had as its goal the overcoming of film evils by the production of pictures of a distinctly worth while nature, as contrasted with the "junk" viewed at many picture houses. That was a month ago. As yet I have had no reply to my query and it looks as if I would not have.

After a close association with the motion picture business, for a period of almost ten years, part of which time was spent actually in the business, I have come to the conclusion that it is hopeless to try to induce the motion picture producers to venture in the making of any picture of a constructive character. They are afraid of "preaching" and tell you that they are in the business to make money and not to uplift society. I know, for I have interviewed plenty of production heads both in New York and Hollywood on the subjects. If any real progress is to be made with the motion picture as an instrument of education I believe the push will have to come from the outside. The Theatre Guild in New York showed the way to the commercial theatrical producers. The same thing could be done in the field of motion pictures provided sufficient brains, talent and money proved to be forthcoming.

The object of this communication is to point out the fact just mentioned, and to inquire if UNITY could not act as an exchange through which ideas could be exchanged and contacts made between people who see the importance of the problem and are interested in doing something about it. Plenty has been written about the evil effects of the motion picture, but few people seem to be doing anything about them. How about some action?

DONN MARVIN

Chicago, Illinois.

The League and India

Editor of UNITY:

If the power vested in the League of Nations is limited to moral pressure, is it not possible to use moral suasion against Great Britain in her attitude toward India? She has declared war, a much more unchristian war in India, than that between Japan and China, as India is not given a sporting chance, a chance to fight her enemy on open ground.

Great Britain is pushing her campaign at home of "Buy British goods". When India echoes the cry in her own country: "Buy Indian goods," she is put behind iron bars.

Will not Dr. Holmes, or one equally eloquent, raise the voice at Geneva on behalf of India?

MARY B. DAIN

New York City.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 346)

accused, with power to impose sentence of death or transportation for life. No appeals are permitted over the decisions of this ghastly engine of oppression and tyranny. (See UNITY, Jan. 18, 1932, p. 288; Chicago).

(4) Upon return to India from the "packed" Round Table Conference in London Gandhi asked Viceroy Willingdon for an interview with a view to understanding the meaning of the Bengal Ordinance; the Viceroy showed him the prison cell—without recourse to due process of law. Verily, India asked for bread and was given stone! Nay, more: the rigors of the Bengal Ordinance were immediately extended to all parts of India, and prominent Congressmen and women soon began to be lodged behind prison bars. In a sense, the whole of India is today a vast prisonhouse.

(5) Congress funds are impounded by the British government of India, likewise are impounded the funds of several pro-Congress businessmen and merchants.

(6) "Buy British" is considered highly patriotic in England; in India, "Buy Indian" is declared to be high treason by the alien British government.

(7) Let humanitarians note: the mere attempt to discourage the consumption of liquor and opium is considered seditious in India by the British—shall we say, Brutish?—government of India!

(8) The kept British press does not publish these gruesome facts, hence the colossal ignorance of the average Englishman regarding India, Gandhi and the Congress. The American press deserves to be congratulated upon the more generous space it devotes to Gandhi and India than does the British press. The average American is better posted in regard to India's non-violent revolution for freedom than is the average Briton.

Of late, however, I am disturbed by the tone of the American press. Even the liberal journals and newspapers have been recording the most ruthless acts of oppression in India as though they were mere mathematical formulae, calling for detached unimpassioned statement. This is all the more alarming in view of the fact that these very journals and papers had most avidly jumped to their feet to denounce Japan's aggressions in Man-

churia. Does White Imperialism seem to them to be less galling than Yellow Imperialism? Or, is Britain's sensitivity to be respected and Japan's flouted?

(9) In my young life I have made many predictions which have stood the test of time. I will hazard two more: (1) That Lord Willingdon shall be the last Viceroy sent out by England to India; (2) that before the year 1932 runs its full course of twelve months the British Empire shall be compelled to negotiate with Gandhi behind prison bars and conclude an agreement with him at a square table conference, solemnly accepting the All-India National Congress as the *de jure* successor to the British Raj in India.

(10) It becomes the high privilege and solemn duty of the American people to point out to the jingoistic British press and ignorant Britishers that British rule is making a hasty exit from India, surely though unwillingly. Gandhi's movement is based upon Truth and *Ahimsa* (Non-Violence; Love). India expects you not to cherish hatred for the British people nor to circulate falsehoods about them: she does appeal to you to spread the Truth about India in the spirit of non-violence and love.

The remarkable heroism of the Indian people—men, women, and children—who are today cheerfully carrying their cross to calvary is unique in the annals of human history. The scheming British imperialist, according to the testimony of Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald himself ("The Awakening of India," pp. 126-127: London, 1910), has been the author of so-called communal riots and splits: in these pregnant days you do not hear of Hindu-Muslim trouble. Let the world realize that India has served notice upon Britain to remain in our midst on our own terms or to clear out.

In this connection may I appeal to Secretary Stimson to take whatever steps he deems necessary to remove one cause of possible friction and misunderstanding between India and America? Certain American citizens in India have enrolled themselves as members of the emergency cavalry corps under British commanders and may be called upon at any time to combat India's non-violent revolution for freedom. Certainly it cannot be a matter of pride to America that any of her citizens should be arrayed against India in her non-violent battle for freedom. Certainly such an unhappy situation cannot promote the cause of Indo-American commerce or good-will. India and America, be it noted happily, are being drawn closer together by American missionaries and educators who are being forced out of India in ever increasing numbers by the British government for their devotion to Truth—to Gandhi.

In the words of Mahatma Gandhi: "The Indian struggle (for freedom) bears in its consequences not only upon India (and England) but upon the whole world . . . the means adopted by us for attaining that liberty are unique. . . May I not, then, on behalf of these semi-starved millions (of India), appeal to the conscience of the world to come to the rescue of a people dying to regain its liberty."

HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR.

India Independence Day
January 26, 1932.

Are Juvenile Books Inane?

Teachers, pretty generally, may be heard to say that they can pick out, almost at first contact, the child who has been read to at home. That is probably true.

One can scarcely think of a better way of beginning an education than reading to a child. The child who is read to early wants to read for himself and does. He has learned, too, that what he does not understand, as he reads, may be asked about. The child who has been read to has had the advantage of a great array of footnotes and annotations, so to speak.

The adult may become tired and bored at times by a too insistent demand for reading, but, on the whole, if there is something worth while to read, both reader and listener must highly enjoy themselves. But it goes without saying that the adult can hardly be lured for long into reading purely nonsensical trash. Juvenile literature would not likely be what the adult reader would choose for himself, but if it is well done, free from inanity, the adult reader will not be bored, even though the story be essentially a child's story.

The above considerations are raised in connection with a statement just made to the effect that of the 800 juvenile books published last year only 140 of the number were recommended for use. This judgment was expressed before a meeting of the Child Study association committee on children's books, at a meeting of the committee the other day in New York.

Of the books declared harmful something like 150 were named as actually pernicious because of the situations depicted and perversion of ideals. But, for the most part, fault was found with the books because they were utterly inane and poorly written. In short, they were so lacking in merit that it was recommended they be kept from children.

The declaration against so many books intended for juvenile reading is the more disturbing because any one who has had contact with the deluge of modern books intended for children and young people of the early teens must have been struck by the utter futility of most of them. The Boy Scout idea, for instance, has been commercially exploited, by a certain class of writers, to a disturbing degree. The host of books employing scouting as a background set forth no pernicious teaching, of course. The fact against them is their utter inanity. Stories of boys' schools fall into the same class. Their stupidity for the most part is in stark contrast with the stories for boys by Trowbridge, Stephens, recently deceased Oliver Optic, James Otis, Harry Castlemon, and others, who were writing when the Youth's Companion and the Golden Days were in their heydey.

The Lansing (Mich.) *State Journal.*

Phone Oakland 0489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE AT JOHNSON'S

4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs, Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

A New Volume of
The New Humanist
begins with the
January-February Issue
containing

A Meditation on Modernism
by A. Eustace Haydon

Parrington: A Liberal of the Northwest
by Alexander P. Cappon

Tragedy, and the Mystery of Nature
by F. S. Stowell

A Sketch of Gandhi
by Sureth C. Banerji

Discussions and Book Reviews

by Henry Nelson Wieman, Robert J. Hutcheon, Radislov A. Tasanoff, Eldred C. Vanderlaan, Hugh S. Tigner, James Horton, Walter Kahoe, Harold Buschman.

Subscription, One Dollar
Single Copy, Twenty Cents

THE NEW HUMANIST
14 West First Street
DAYTON, OHIO